8

10 11 12

q

13 14 15

16 17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

in their interviews with the Probation Office when they were representing that they were unable to make restitution at all. think that we've got not just last spring to look at, but also what's been said by the defendants about their financial situation in the last month or two.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Anything further that you wanted to express?

MR. ARRIOLA: Well, Your Honor, that also -- that fact that they did accept the court appointed counsel, again, is evidence that these people really didn't understand what was going on. And they were given, they were appointed counsel. They had money initially, and they retained a private attorney to represent them.

Now, subsequently, when the court appointed counsels and were given to them, all they understood was that they were, they wouldn't have to pay those court appointed counsels. But I think initially, when they retained Mr. Pierce, it was their understanding that they had to pay for that service, and they did.

THE COURT: Well, they did. They paid for Mr. Pierce's service, but they didn't pay for the other two service, lawyers' services.

MR. ARRIOLA: They, that's what they initially did when they retained Mr. Pierce, paid him based on the three defendants, not on A00643

ar maga assam San yaya kaffa s

one defendant.

1 2

3

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

THE COURT: Mr. Arriola, have you reviewed this file? They filed what is called Financial Affidavits and they certified that all of the information in the affidavit is true. And the court asked them if they know that a false or dishonest answer to any question in that affidavit can be used against them later for prosecution for making a false statement or for perjury. And based upon the information, the court makes a determination whether they're eligible or not for court appointed counsel. The court did that in this case. Did you review the file?

MR. ARRIOLA: Yes. And, Your Honor, I understand that. I'm just, I'm relating to Your Honor what I, what information I got from my, from the defendants. I understand all of that, and I even mentioned to them, in addition to that, all the statements that were, all the statements that were made to Your Honor were made under oath. But, again, they kept coming back to say they were just were confused. They, when they answered, it was based on advice. They didn't know what they wanted to do in this case. They just were worried that, that they didn't have a chance of winning this case, because -- and, Your Honor, all we ask is that Your Honor reconsiders its tentative ruling and just allow these defendants to go forward and prove their innocence in this case. A00046

24

3

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

12

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. de Baca?

MR. de BACA: Your Honor, I'll try to be fairly brief, which may be new for me, but the claims that's been made, so far, is basically an untested assertion of confusion and involuntariness; and, in fact, it's contradicted by all of the objective evidence before the court. Obviously, the inquiry that the court carefully made at the Rule 11 hearing is the first and the best piece of evidence as to whether this was a voluntary plea. There's some other objective proof of voluntariness out there.

For instance, Your Honor, the three plea agreements and the stipulations of facts and guidelines application are all different. They're the result of individual negotiations had back and forth between the government and defense counsel and the defendants. Had there just been one plea agreement that was a cookie-cutter approach to all of them, perhaps, there would be a little more credence to what they're claiming. However, the very content of the plea agreements indicates that this was a process that the defense, the defendants were involved in; they were engaged in; and that they were not just mere standers-by watching their defense attorneys carve out something that they had no idea what was going on. ADGGAY

2 3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

13

Your Honor, the length of time that we're talking about as well, three months or more after the entry of the pleas and the timing of this motion, coming as it did after they, the defendants had reviewed the presentence reports with their actual lawyers, strongly suggests the case of a presentencing jitters, or a presentencing change of heart.

To allow the defendants to now simply, under their assertion of confusion or involuntariness or pressure, withdraw their pleas would make the plea agreements in this case, and in every case, be simply a placeholder, something to see what the government is willing to give, to see what the presentence report comes at, and then to backup claimed confusion, and try to get out of it.

'If Your Honor concludes that there is not a fair and just reason to withdraw these pleas, you don't even need to look at the prejudice or lack thereof to the government. But I will speak to that, as you had asked.

As you know, the government was within hours of going to trial in this case. We were prepared. The victims were prepared. The witnesses were prepared. The prosecutors and the agents were prepared. By pleading this case out, we took everything to a stand down. Several witnesses have moved on. One of them went back to A00048

3

5

6

7

R 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

14

Korea. The rest are in Guam still. But we would have to come back out, work with them again. And, in effect, start the entire process from scratch.

The imposition of inconvenience upon the court, as well as the judicial resources that the court has to take a look at are other things that the court should examine in making its ruling, and, obviously, Your Honor, having to bring in another jury pool, having to engage in a five- to six-week trial -- sometimes we had talked about it as being as low as three, but I think that we have to figure that it would be somewhere between three and six weeks total -- would be quite a bit of inconvenience not only to counsel but to the court, prejudice to the government, flowing, again, from the fact that, you know, we have now stretched this case out, due to scheduling issues or defense continuances or other things, long enough that witnesses' memories or emotional responses have faded that much more, all of which would prejudice the government were we to go forth.

So I urge Your Honor to not even reach the point of looking at prejudice to the government or inconvenience to the court because Your Honor does not need to. There is no fair and just reason for withdrawal based on the objective evidence in this case, objective evidence that shows that this was a voluntary plea.

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

1 2

As to the allegations that the defendants have been making, what they're really alleging is tension, tension of negotiations. What they say is pressure that was actually advice of counsel. And I point out that had there been no such advice of counsel and they had gone to jail after a trial for a substantially lengthy period of time, they would then have turned around and made an ineffective-assistance claim based on that. So I urge the court to reject this and to go straight to sentencing as scheduled.

THE COURT: Mr. Baka, did you want to be heard?

MR. BAKA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Arriola, did you want to reply?

MR. ARRIOLA: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor, contrary to the government's assertion, this is not a presentencing jitters. These, these people, according to them, soon after the change of plea hearing, were mulling over their actions. And, in fact, I think the admission is at once that they were looking around for an attorney, they did meet with another translator, and then they found me before the end of last year. It's not, it's not something that they just decided last week. And, also, Your Honor, this is not a post sentencing motion where they're weighing, you know, the potential time that they'll be spending incarcerated. They know what the sentencing guidelines call for. They we gone through

that. This is not about jitters; it's not about what the government said it was, tension.

It would be terrible if we forgo the opportunity to have the defendants, give them the opportunity to prove their innocence in this case. The government states that they 11 be prejudiced because they, after the change, after the plea agreements, there was a stand down. Well, the case hasn't been concluded. Yes, they did plead, but it's not over yet. They did record a lot of the statements they received from their witnesses. If there was memory problems, they can just bring in their witnesses and go through their, their report. I don't see the prejudice there. I think the fact that these people have declared their innocence and wish their day in court out weighs any of the prejudice that's been claimed by the government.

Again, Your Honor, we ask you to reconsider your tentative ruling and just allow these defendants to have their day in court.

THE COURT: Thank you. The court is ready to rule on the motion. The motion is denied. It wouldn't be fair, it wouldn't be just to allow these defendants to withdraw their pleas at this time. They were advised of all of their constitutional rights. They told me under oath that they understood every aspect of the A00055

24 25

1 2

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

plea agreement, that they had no questions about it. They told me that they understood all of their constitutional rights, that they we discussed those rights with their lawyers, and they didn't have any questions about those rights. They each stood before this court and expressed what it is that they did, that they wanted to enter a plea of guilty to the pleas that they did enter. They didn't say, "because I did it;" or they didn't say, "I'm guilty."

They assented to every single element of the crime that they did it within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; that they had the intent to do what they did; and they were advised that by entering a plea of guilty, they were giving up all of their constitutional rights to a trial and waived or given up their rights associated with a trial as I described them to them.

I find that they were not intimidated; that they knew exactly what they were saying; that they told me that they weren't under any threat or force. And the pleas were accepted, and the plea agreements were accepted, and they were judged guilty of the offense.

I find that there's also prejudice to the plaintiff. There is great inconvenience to the court, with interference with the court's administration of its calendar to put this back on AOCC5?

calendar after all of the time that the court has spent with the attorneys and the defendants.

And for all of those reasons, I think that the denial of the motion is certainly justified. And there has been no good reason or cause shown to the court for the court to rule otherwise.

1.8

Now I would like to hear from Mr. Pierce, and Sorensen and Williams relative to their motions to be relieved as counsel of record.

MR. PIERCE: Your Honor, Dick Pierce. Under the rules, Model of Rules of Professional Conduct, which are the rules which are adopted by this court, under declining or terminating representation, of course, in a criminal context, we have to get the authority of the court to completely withdraw from a proceeding. But there is, a presumption is, one, the lawyer is discharged. That's the Model Rule 1.6(a)(3). And I think by hiring Mr. Arriola, and other conversations, I have been discharged by my client, and my client no longer wishes my services in this proceeding.

There are other reasons, Your Honor, for terminating representation, if withdrawal can be accomplished without material adverse effects in the interest of the client. Well, if the client has professed a desire to have other representations, then AOCC55

14

15

9

19

20

certainly for me to withdraw would not materially adverse that client.

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you for a second, Mr. Pierce. If the court granted your motion to be relieved as counsel of record in this case, would you be willing to act as counsel for the court to sit by during sentencing or at any other time between now and sentencing for the purpose of assisting Mr. Arriola if Mr. Arriola needed your assistance?

MR. PIERCE: Yes, Your Honor. I would be glad to do that. To recognize, I think -- I'm not sure there would be any kind of conflict by my representation. I could do that, Your Honor, as long as it could be done without any kind of conflict between myself, under the rules, and the client.

THE COURT: Well, you would be counsel appointed by the court to standby.

MR. PIERCE: Yes, Your Honor. My duties would be to Mr. Kwon, Mo.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. PIERCE: Yes. I'll be glad to do that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That would, that would be the order if you're in agreement. And the Kwons, on the record, make all of the right answers relative to being represented by one lawyer.

3 5

6

7

10 11

12

13

14

19

20

21

22 23 24

25

MR. PIERCE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Right. Mr. Sorensen, you would also be agreeable? MR. SORENSEN: Yes. Yes, Your Honor, if it's the court's pleasure.

THE COURT: All right. And for Mr. Smith, Mr. Williams? MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, we'd also be in agreement with that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Before I rule on that, I would ask the clerk to, please, administer the oath to all three defendants.

THE CLERK: Will all three defendants, please, rise. Please raise your right hands. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you're about to give in this case now before this court will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

THE DEFENDANTS: (Through interpreter for all three) Yes.

MR. PIERCE: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. PIERCE: Could we have, or could I have five minutes of the court's time with Mr. Mo Kwon about something? And certainly in Mr. Arriola's presence, too. I'm not sure.

THE COURT: You want to take a recess?

MR. PIERCE: Just about five minutes, Your Honor. I think we might be able to resolve something here.

ADOLDS

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

THE COURT: We'll take a five-minute recess or until the clerk notifies the court that counsel are ready to proceed.

Oh, Mr. de Baca, do you want to standby for about five minutes or do you want us to call you back?

MR. de BACA: Not a problem. I could just standby. I'll wait. THE COURT: Well, you know, you know what it means when a lawyer says, "I have one more question or just for, I need five minutes," it may well be a while. I think we'll call you back.

MR. de BACA: Okay, certainly.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

(Court recessed at 10:30 a.m., Thursday, January 27, 2000, and reconvened at 10:45 a.m. same day.)

THE CLERK: Please remain seated and come to order. This court is again in session.

THE COURT: We're back on the record in Criminal Action 98-44. All of the attorneys that have previously announced their appearance are present in the courtroom.

Mr. de Baca, are you on the telephone?

MR. de BACA: Yes, I am, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The record will also reflect that all three defendants and the interpreter-translator are present in the courtroom.

and was in the same for an

--

22

1 2

3

4

10 11 12

13

14

15 16 17

18

19

20 21 22

23

24

25

Mr. Pierce, did you want to report to the court?

MR. PIERCE: Yes, Your Honor. We've had discussions with the three defendants. When I say, "we," I mean Mr. Arriola, myself, Mr. Sorensen and Mr. Williams. And it's agreed, and I certainly would prefer -- because of the affidavits that have been filed -that the court inquire of each defendant on the record. But because of the history of the case and because the court's ruling today, we believe that it would be more effective for the defendants and for the administration of justice if the three of us again served as primary counsel, and Mr. Arriola was allowed to withdraw his appearance. In other words, the special appearance for this motion, and that Mr. Arriola will handle any appeal for the defendants.

And I also represent to the court, and certainly the court can inquire of Mr. Kwon -- if the court will recall, Mo Kwon had the, is the one who had the ability and retained myself originally for his family, too. And that's the case this time, and it's reflected in the assets in the presentence report, that Mo Kwon had the assets to liquidate and to pay for Mr. Arriola on behalf of his entire family. And so the fact that the prior affidavits related to elder Mr. Kwon and Mrs. Kwon's statements of inability to retain counsel are not inaccurate at all. We'll just

H00057

ì 2 3

5 6 7

8

13

14

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

reflect -- this current representation reflects the son's assets, which are in the presentence report.

And so if that's acceptable with the court, Mr. Arriola will withdraw just, and help the Kwons on sentencing, and the three of us would continue with the representation through the sentencing phase.

THE COURT: This is 180 degrees.

MR. PIERCE: Well, Your Honor, I think Mr. -- I think Mr. Arriola can certainly explain it to you. I think Mr. Arriola had the, had that intent with the clients if the motion was not successful.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Mr. Arriola?

MR. ARRIOLA: That's correct, Your Honor. We had a meeting out there and that's what I intended to do, is to help the defendants with just specifically with the plea agreements, to withdraw the plea agreements. And because Mr. Pierce, Sorensen, and Mr. Smith had, had made or are more familiar with the history of the case, as well as the preparation for sentencing, that it would be more effective if they handled the sentencing phase, and I will handle the, any possible appeal for this withdrawal motion.

THE COURT: Mr. Kwon, Soon Oh, is it your desire to be -- is it your desire to continue to be represented by Mr. Richard Pierce in AOCC55

this matter?

2 3

6

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

MR. PIERCE: Eric Smith, Your Honor, for Mr. --

THE COURT: Pardon me?

MR. PIERCE: That'll be Eric Smith and Mark Williams.

THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. Is it your desire to be continued to be represented by Mr. Eric Smith and Mr. Williams in this matter?

DEFENDANT SOON OH KWON: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, I thought your affidavit indicated that you lost confidence in Mr. Smith as your attorney?

DEFENDANT SOON OH KWON: So I think I have no other choice.

THE COURT: Well, you can answer this question because it's easy, "yes" or "no." Do you have confidence in Mr. Smith and Mr. Williams' legal ability to represent you between now and the time of sentencing?

DEFENDANT SOON OH KWON: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you want to have Mr. Smith and Mr. Williams continue to represent you?

DEFENDANT SOON OH KWON: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Kwon, Mo Young, you are represented by Mr. Sorensen in this case -- I'm sorry -- Mr. Pierce.

3

4

5

6

7

R 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

DEFENDANT MO YOUNG KWON: Yes.

THE COURT: And do you have confidence in Mr. Pierce's ability to continue to represent you between now and the time of sentencing in this matter?

DEFENDANT MO YOUNG KWON: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you want Mr. Pierce to continue representing you between now and the time of sentencing?

DEFENDANT MO YOUNG KWON: Yes.

THE COURT: Meng, Ying Yu, you are represented by Mr. Sorensen, correct?

DEFENDANT YING YU MENG: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you want to continue to be represented by Mr. Sorensen between now and the time of sentencing?

DEFENDANT YING YU MENG: Yes.

THE COURT: You have confidence in Mr. Sorensen's legal ability to properly represent you?

DEFENDANT YING YU MENG: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Arriola?

MR. ARRIOLA: Sorry, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Do you have anything further?

MR. ARRIOLA: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Well, I do make a finding that the defendants have

7

8 4

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

made an intelligent choice, determination, an informed choice that they want to continue to be represented by Mr. Pierce, Messrs. Smith and Williams, and Mr. Sorensen. And accordingly, their motion is granted. Mr. Arriola's motion to be relieved as counsel of record at this time -- is that correct?

MR. ARRIOLA: For any other matter, my appearance is strictly for the plea agreements with the motion for withdrawal of the plea agreements.

THE COURT: So your motion is to be relieved as counsel of record in this court at this time. You're still going to have these people as clients but you don't want to participate --

MR. ARRIOLA: Between now and sentencing.

THE COURT: Between now and after sentencing, correct?

MR. ARRIOLA: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That motion is granted.

Now, on the court's own motion, I'm very concerned about the defendants being at liberty. It appears to me that the defendants may well pose a substantial flight risk at this time due to the fact that they have now claimed their innocence and wanting to withdraw their guilty pleas. I think this drastically changes the court's feeling about their being at liberty.

When the court accepted the pleas and the plea

1

6 7 8

9

14 15 16

18 19

20

21

17

22 23 24

25

agreements, it was requested that the defendants have three weeks to clean up their affairs, and that has now been -- I forget -- a few months. And it is the intention of the court at this time to withdraw their liberty and have them remanded to the custody of the Marshal Service for fear of flight. I will hear argument from any counsel.

MR. de BACA: Your Honor, the government supports that sua sponte motion. I think that what has happened today is a clear indication that the mere words of the defendants is not something that the court can rely upon absent anything else. Furthermore, it sounds as though, based on their representation through counsel today, that they have perhaps more wherewithal than we've been led to believe, and, therefore, would have more ability to flee if their nervousness in the face of their oncoming sentencing continues to grow.

THE COURT: Mr. Pierce?

MR. PIERCE: Your Honor, to comment on that, I think it's just exactly the opposite. We said, and I think Mr. de Baca can look at the presentence reports, that Mr. Mo Kwon had sufficient assets which if liquidated would garnish the fee that he's put up for Mr. Arriola. And so, quite the contrary, I think, and quite contrary to the court's kind of intuitive thoughts here, if the one or more A0066...

of the defendants wanted to flee, they would have, and if they could have the possibility to do so, obviously by the court's feeling, they would have done so. Instead, they did not.

Now perhaps I don't agree with what happened, the procedures they took, but they did appeal not to flight, not to shaky boat rides or false passports. They, whatever assets they had, Mr. Mo Kwon liquidated, they hired an attorney to appeal to this court. That is quite the behavior that -- some of the contents, perhaps, the affidavits need to be explained further, and we can work on that. But as far as behaving like civilized human beings who are obeying the court's order, they came to this court and asked for assistance --

THE COURT: Well, --

MR. PIERCE: -- instead of fleeing.

THE COURT: Well, --

MR. PIERCE: And so the fact is that their mind frame, Your Honor, is that they know they're within the system and they have to work within the system. That is a long way from having a mind set on flight from prison.

THE COURT: I agree with you up to the point that now the circumstances have changed and their motion has been denied. It occurs to me that now there's no downside risk for them attempting

A00083

ı 2

3

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

29

to leave the Commonwealth. They have no reason to stay and every reason to leave.

MR. PIERCE: Your Honor, I think I have not -- obviously, I was not privy to the conversations between Mr. Arriola and the people, but certainly, as this court can expect that Mr. Arriola wisely advised them that the chance and success on this motion were extremely low, and that the -- and I'm sure that none of the people came here today thinking that this court was going to, in all probability, grant this request for relief; the probability was low. And I think that for us to then, therefor, jump to conclusion that they are now set to, set to flee, I think, is not a presumption that we should, or an inference even that we can accept. And I think their behavior is exactly the opposite.

Recall, Your Honor, and I think they still have a child here. They still, I mean, the business is ongoing down at the Kwons grocery. Certainly, if the government had evidence of flight, they would present it, they would have it. I think the government before has had -- I don't know what they call them -informant or something, talk about the Kwons. If they have any such evidence, they would certainly present it to this court, that they re packing their bags.

THE COURT: What are the assets of the defendants at this time? A0006a

23

24

25

MR. PIERCE: Your Honor, I don't have the presentence with me. Maybe -- Mr. Sorensen, do you have the presentence? Maybe, I do. Your Honor.

THE COURT: While you're looking for that, I see the marshal in the courtroom. Have the defendants reported all of the times required?

DEPUTY MARSHAL JACOT: Yes, they have.

THE COURT: They have. And that is three times a week or five times a week?

DEPUTY MARSHAL JACOT: Five times a week for, I believe, the two of them and for the other one, it's three times a week.

THE COURT: You're saying for the mother and father, two times? DEPUTY MARSHAL JACOT: Yes, and for the other defendant, it's three times.

MR. PIERCE: Your Honor, I don't think that Mr. -- I think that Mr. Mo Kwon sold the pickup truck, Your Honor. And that's certainly an -- I know that's an asset. We told the Probation Officer back up there, giving the interview.

As far as Mr., the elder -- I'm referring to page 11 of the presentence -- they have a total assets of \$4,218.22, from the savings account, two checking accounts or business checking account, and then about \$2,000 a month from the market, which is A**0**0065

the market down in old the nightclub, Your Honor. And then that goes to more of the expenses. And that's for the elder Kwon. And I don't recall -- I don't think that Ms. Meng had any assets, Your Honor. I don't recall. Maybe Mr. de Baca can help on that. I don't have that in front of me this minute.

THE COURT: All right. Anything further?

MR. de BACA: Your Honor, I think that we would not necessarily be opposed to changing their conditions of release to have a higher bond, perhaps, and more frequent checking in. We certainly don't want them to be punished for having been down the garden path by a new counsel who, perhaps, gave them false hope.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know that they have much to put up from what Mr. Pierce has just expressed to the court. So I am ready to rule on this matter. The defendants will remain at liberty under all of the same terms and conditions that the court has previously set.

Is there anything further to come before the court?

MR. PIERCE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. de Baca?

MR. de BACA: No, Your Honor.

MR. ARRIOLA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: There being nothing further to come before the

ADDLES

9

10

1 2

3

11 12 13

14

15

20 21

22 23

24

court from any counsel, we'll stand in recess at this time. Thank you. (Court recessed at 11:20 a.m., Thursday, January 27, 2000.) A00067

> 24 25

COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS ) SAIPAN, MP

I, SANAE N. SHMULL, an Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceeding in Criminal Action No. 98-00044, United States of America v. Kwon, Soon Oh, Kwon, Mo Young and Meng, Ying Yu, consisting of 32 pages, was taken down by me stenographically and with a back-up tape recording device at the time and place indicated herein, Thursday, January 27, 2000.

That the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceeding transcribed by me to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not interested in the events of the action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name and signature this 5th day of June, 2000.

Official Court Reporter